

Opposing Views

Attachment #21

Timber Harvest Degrades Forest Health and Restores nothing in a Forested Ecosystem

Logging not Restoration Opposing View #1 - "We question the validity of thinning as a means both to reduce the threat of wildfire and to restore historic forest structure in the absence of site-specific data collection on past and present landscape conditions."

Platt, Rutherford V. Ph.D., Thomas T. Veblen Ph.D., and Rosemary L. Sherriff "**Are Wildfire Mitigation and Restoration of Historic Forest Structure Compatible? A Spatial Modeling Assessment**" Published Online: by the Association of American Geographers. Sep. 8, 2006

<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/anna/2006/00000096/00000003/art00001>



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #2 - "Even 'kinder, gentler' commercial logging still inflicts environmental impacts such as eroded topsoil, degraded water quality, destroyed wildlife habitat, and extirpated species that are every bit as much symptoms of forest health problems as large-scale, severe wildfires."

Ingalsbee, Timothy Ph.D. "**Logging for Firefighting: A Critical Analysis of the Quincy Library Group Fire Protection Plan.**"

Unpublished research paper. 1997.

http://www.fire-ecology.org/research/logging-for-firefighting_2.htm



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #3 - “Fifth, thinning introduces diseases and pests, wounds the trees left behind, and generally disrupts natural processes, including some that regulate forest health, all the more so if road construction is involved.”

Lawrence, Nathaniel, NRDC senior attorney
“**Gridlock on the National Forests**” Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health (Committee on Resources) December 4, 2001.
<http://www.nrdc.org/land/forests/tnl1201.asp>



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #4 - “Traditionally, the term ‘forest health’ has been used in a limited, utilitarian sense by professional foresters to refer to the growth and vigor of trees (see Kolb et al. 1994). For example, according to one Forest Service publication, a forest is healthy when “biotic and abiotic influences on forests do not threaten management objectives now or in the future” (USFS 1993). From this perspective, a forest is healthy if trees are free from insects and pathogens and growing at maximum rates; it is unhealthy if trees are dead or dying. Anything that decreases or threatens to decrease yield (insects, disease, decaying trees, fire) is something to be controlled or eliminated. Managers therefore argue for removal and commercial utilization of trees that are perceived to be in danger from such threats.”

“However, many conservationists and forest scientists have expressed concern about such thinking. This narrow definition of forest health does not consider the health of the entire ecosystem, such as water and soil quality and the diversity and interactions of other life forms. It does not provide guidance for management of resources other than timber. It has encouraged foresters to simplistically view insects and other non-timber

An OP-ED from the May 1, 1997 Oregonian
<http://www.subtleenergies.com/ormus/bmnfa/fire&log.htm>



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #7 - “According to Arthur Partridge (former logger, Forest Service employee, and professor at the University of Idaho), “Claiming harm to forest health is merely an excuse to log.... In terms of disease and insects there has been no difference in true forest health for at least 50 years.”

“National Forest Fact Sheet Myths and Facts of Logging National Forests”
http://www.rso.cornell.edu/snrc/documents/NFPA_MythsFacts.pdf



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #8 - “Commercial logging is not a prescription for forest health; it is one of the major causes of unhealthy forest conditions. Until the forest products industry stops trying to insist that clearcutting our public lands is necessary for the health of those lands, we will make no progress in restoring those lands. Equating forest health with timber company profits condemns out forests to either the commercial ravages of the past or the management paralysis of the present. Both are bad for our forests and for those of us who have chosen to live in beautiful, but naturally dangerous, forested landscapes.”

Power, Thomas Ph.D. “**The Politics of Forest Fires -- The Abuse of Other People's Hard Times.**”

8/15/2000

Thomas Michael Power is the Professor and Chairman of the Economics Department, University of Montana

<http://www.forwolves.org/ralph/tompower.htm>



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #9 - “Roads and log yards required for logging operations create gaps in the canopy and change the ecology of the forest. A healthy forest depends on a wealth of biodiversity, but operating the heavy equipment necessary to remove large trees from the forest destroys many of the smaller plants, animal habitat and microbotic organisms that live in the soil.

The DNR claims that logging promotes forest health, but even a brief visit to a logging site quickly dispels the truth of this claim. The DNR typically marks the large, commercially valuable trees for sale, not the sick or overcrowded smaller trees. Any gardener knows that you do not weed out the largest, healthiest plants for good cultivation.”

Haberman, David “**End logging in Indiana state forests**”
Indiana Daily Student, January 9, 2002
<http://www.idsnews.com/news/story.aspx?id=19735&comview=1>



Logging not Restoration Opposing View #10 - “Recently, so called "salvage" logging has increased on national forests in response to a timber industry invented "forest health crisis" which points the finger at normal forest processes of fire, fungi, bacteria, insects and other diseases. In fact the crisis in the national forests is habitat destruction caused by too much clearcutting.”

A statement by Arthur Partridge, Ph.D.
At a Press Conference with Senator Robert Torricelli, April 28, 1998, U.S. Capitol
<http://www.saveamericasforests.org/news/ScientistsStatement.htm>